DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 370 365 FL 022 042

AUTHOR Malcolm, Ian G.
TITLE Language Teacher Education for Social Cohesion.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 22p.; In: Sadtono, Eugenius, Ed. Issues in Language Teacher Education. Anthology Series 30; see FL 022 033.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation; *Cultural Pluralism; Dialects; *Educational Policy; Foreign Countries; Government Role; Higher Education; *Language Teachers; Multicultural Education; Nationalism; *Politics of Education; *Socialization; *Teacher Education; Teacher Educators; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Australia

ABSTRACT

This article examines the social implications of language teacher education in light of the current emphasis on diversity and multiculturalism in education, with special reference to Australian society. It explains and discusses the ramifications of policies promoting: (1) assimilation, which advocates monolingualism and the eradication of dialects; (2) multiculturalism, which advocates community language maintenance and the appreciation of dialect differences; (3) nationalism, which advocates subtractive bilingualism and monodialectalism; and (4) instrumentalism, which advocates additive bilingualism and bidialectism. It argues that language teacher education needs to be aware of the sociopolitical environment in which it operates and make language education socially relevant. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 370 365

Language Teacher Education for Social Cohesion

Ian G. Malcolm

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hong Kim
Hong

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL 022042

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL COHESION

Ian G Malcolm

Social and Linguistic Diversity

I begin by stating a truism with respect to society: Social and linguistic diversity and inequality are ever-present and are systematically interrelated. The richness of inter-lingual and intra-lingual variation, and the social meanings carried by such variation, have been documented by sociolinguistics in societies all over the world, and where there is linguistic difference there is always the potential for it to be associated with social inequality.

According to the recently released language and literacy policy document of the Australian Government (Australian Department of Employment, Education and Training, 1991:1) a strong relationship has been revealed between low levels of literacy or English language competence and high levels of unemployment and other forms of social disadvantage. This has come to be the predominant concern of Australian language policy.

For Australians, written standard English has become the meeting ground of social and linguistic inequality. The dominance of written English in Australia reflects the dominance of an educated, native-English-speaking population and the orientation of that society to Western industrialism (Kalantzis, et al, 1989). Historically speaking, it represents the result of a social and linguistic opposition, similar to that which has led to the dominance of English in the United States, of which Robert Phillipson has said:

> The establishment of English as a common national language has involved tragedy and language loss for both indigenous and immigrant groups, (1991:49).

In similar vein, Yukio Tsuda has argued that the American nation "has been established on the deaths of numerous languages" (1986:30) and that:

> The nation-building of the United States was virtually made possible by imposing English upon the native Americans and non-English-speaking immigrants and making them give up their own languages (Tsuda, 1986:29).

Whether the language shift of many of the immigrants to the United States was desired or imposed is, I think, a more open question than Tsuda would have it appear. The fact remains, however, that the appearance of linguistic uniformity in a society may well be more problematic than it seems, and may invite what Giroux has called:

> a commitment to penetrate the world of objectified appearances and to expose the underlying social relationships they often conceal (1983:8).

At the international level, the domination of English is seen by Phillipson as the result of "British and American policy to promote English overseas as a means of extending and expanding influence" (1991:48). The effect, as detailed by Tsuda, is that English dominates to the extent that 76% of all secondary students in the non-English speaking world, excluding China, are studying English (1986:1). Even in countries which have shaken off a colonial past, European languages continue to confer prestige upon their users (Tsuda, 1986:3). Now, given that, in all societies, both social diversity and linguistic diversity are present to a greater or lesser extent, and that the distribution of linguistic varieties within the society relates to the members of the society in ways that elevate some over others, the management of the use of language varieties within a society has symbolic significance. Put more simply, those who seek to control a society will, of necessity, seek at the same time to control the way that society uses language. So we find that increasingly, the "management" (Advisory Council on Multicultural Affairs, 1988:1) of linguistic diversity is an issue for governments, and the options open to governments seem to be constrained by irresistible political and economic considerations.

In managing linguistic diversity in a society, the authorities are seeking to achieve social ends by linguistic means, that is, by managing language use in a particular way, they seek to reinforce, or to produce, particular perceptions as to how the society is, or ought to be.

Often, one of the primary social goals that language planning is used to achieve is that of social cohesion. (See, e.g. Australian Ethnic Affairs Council Committee on Multicultural Education, 1979:2, Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs, 1982:14, Advisory Council on Multicultural Affairs, 1988:2, Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs, 1982:14, Advisory Council on Multicultural Affairs, 1988:2, Kalantzis, et al 1989:67). Cohesion has been defined as "a state or situation in which all the parts or ideas fit together well so that they form a unified whole" (Collins Cobuild Dictionary). A society which is cohesive will have interrelationships among its parts which will enhance its sense of unity.

To some extent there seems to be a conflict between the unity sought in social cohesion and the diversity which is the social and linguistic reality. However, diversity can co-exist with unity and may even promote it. Cohesion does not depend on the sameness of the interrelated parts. There is, then, an ongoing tension underlying social planning in relation to language. Should social or linguistic diversity be denied in the interests of social cohesion, or should they be exploited to promote it?

Language Education and Diversity

Language educators are, of course, the executors, at the educational level, of policy decisions which have been determined by governments. Their activity actualizes within school, college and university judgements which have been made with respect to the priority of certain linguistic forms in a society over others. John Earl Joseph has observed:

> The awareness of variants seems inevitably to be accompanied by value judgement. For any number of possible reasons, wherever variants are in competition, one will always be preferred to the other, creating hierarchies which it is the task of language education to inculcate. The canonical form of such education is 'Say x, not y.' (1987:16).

My second main observation, then, again a truism, is that language education has always had a social as well as an educational dimension. Language educators, even if they do no more than mechanically teach what they have been told to teach, are reinforcing certain perceptions about the values which are attached to diverse forms of language.

It is, of course, not only the forms of language which carry with them social perceptions, but also the functions. For example, the very fact of teaching people to read is making a social statement. This is especially apparent in the Third World context, for, as Deckert has pointed out:

> ...reading as a highly individualistic individual activity...flourishes mainly in a kind of socio-political climate that does not often prevail in Third World countries (1987:159).

Likewise, although it may be desirable to teach for communicative competence and focus on language in use, an essential question to face is: Whose use? Too often the question has been answered, by implication, with an ethnocentric bias towards English native speakers.

Christina Bratt Paulston has condemned as "cultural imperialism" the assumption that learners of English in, say, China should use it in a way culturally appropriate in U.S.A. (1987:70). Just as English serves the function of "an economic and political statement of citizens of the world" (Paulston, 1987:70) for the people of China, it serves the function of a "working language" for the people of Singapore. It is necessary for this functional perspective to be manifested in the way in which English is taught and examined in Singapore, and for the complementary functions of the Singaporean mother tongues to be equally manifested if what Dr Seet Ai Mee last year in opening the RELC Regional Seminar called the "Singaporean Dilemma" - the declining competence in the mother tongue - is to be satisfactorily dealt with.

A Fast-Changing World

As the theme of this seminar reminds us, this is a fast-changing world, and one of the ways in which change is registered is in the attitudes taken to linguistic diversity. Here I come to my third major point, this time, I think, <u>not</u> a truism. Socio-political orientations within society in relation to language education are subject to change, and a key dimension in such change is the way in which social uniformity and linguistic uniformity, respectively, are evaluated. There is a fundamental dilemma underlying all social and educational planning with respect to language which stems from the nature of society and language, as stated in my first observation, that is, that both are characterised by diversity. It would make life so much more simple if we all thought alike, acted alike and spoke alike. And though governments know that we don't, they are often inclined to treat us as if we did, or as if we ought to. There is, then, a constant shifting of public policy between differing evaluations of social and linguistic diversity.

Indeed, one way of distinguishing the major alternative policy orientations is by looking at the possibilities, expressed terms of extreme positions, for the evaluation of social diversity and linguistic diversity respectively.

I have tried to express these in Figure i.

Evaluation of Social Diversity	Evaluation of Linguistic Diversity	
LOW	LOW	ASSIMILATION
HIGH	HIGH	MULTICULTURALISM
HIGH	LOW	NATIONALISM
LOW	HIGH	INSTRUMENTALISM

Figure i: The Uniformity-Diversity Tension and Public Policy.

I am suggesting here that four predominant orientations may be observed in social policy relating to linguistic and social diversity and that these may be distinguished on the basis of the matching of a particular evaluation of social diversity with a particular evaluation of linguistic diversity. Of course, as is usual in matters of social analysis, we cannot talk in terms of totally discrete categories but rather of emphases. I believe that the four emphases:assimilation, multiculturalism, nationalism, and instrumentalism have been commonly in evidence in contemporary societies, not least in my native Australia, where three of them have underlain three major policy determinations over the past forty years.

Assimilation is a policy which emphasises at the same time social uniformity and linguistic uniformity. It held sway in Australia during the post-war years when immigration deliberately favoured people of European descent, who, after arrival were called "New Australians" and expected to conform to majority norms, both linguistically and socially. The only language education need that was recognized for these people was the need to learn English. From the standpoint of assimilation, language differences in society are a problem which, if ignored, may go away.

At the other end of the scale is the policy of multiculturalism, which prevailed in Australia throughout the 70s and 80s. One of the foundations of multiculturalism is "a comprehensive acceptance of human diversity" (Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs, 1982:33). This policy then places a high evaluation on both social and linguistic diversity. It encourages the maintenance of community languages and recognizes the right (in its Australian expression) of non-English speakers to have access to government services in their own languages.

Where the assimilation policy seeks to achieve social cohesion by maintaining, or promoting, social and linguistic homogeneity, multiculturalism seeks to achieve it by ensuring access and equity to all within a heterogeneous society. From the standpoint of multiculturalism, languages are a human and community resource, and perform an integrative function in society.

I propose the term nationalism, to refer to a policy which acknowledges social diversity but seeks to achieve national unity through the promotion of one language as something all members of the society have in common. Thus, Bislama, an English lexifier Creole, serves as national language and "language of political protest and Melanesian solidarity" (Thomas, 1989:241) in Vanuatu, where there are 105 indigenous and two metropolitan languages, and Tok Pisin is being strongly advocated as the national language in equally multilingual Papua New Guinea (Kale, 1989:187), though it has to compete with English which has far better claims to meeting the demands of instrumentalism. From the standpoint of nationalism, language differences in society are an obstacle to political unity.

I am using the term instrumentalism to refer to a policy which values linguistic diversity of a particular kind within a context of social uniformity. Such a policy has a long history in, for example, China and Japan where a strong conservatism with respect to traditional social values has been accompanied by a promotion of the use of foreign languages for purely instrumental purposes. This is embodied in the Chinese "Ti-Yong" concept, which distinguishes the Ti, or "essence", which is accessible through the home language from the Yong, or "utility," which is served by the foreign language (Chen, 1989:47). A similar expression in Japanese, "wakon yôsai," differentiates Japanese spirit from Western skills (Shimbori, 1960:97). From the standpoint of instrumentalism, languages have value only insofar as they serve the achievement of certain economic or other goals.

I do not want to make these four policy emphases appear more mutually exclusive than they are. Clearly, elements of more than one may co-exist in the same policy, though it is usually arguable that one predominates.

In Australia the nineties have seen a shift away from multiculturalism in the direction of instrumentalism, with a de-emphasis on the use and public support of community languages and an apparent loss of confidence in their ability to contribute to social cohesion. In their place, foreign languages are being promoted for purely pragmatic, or "strategic" purposes.

There are evidences from at least Australia, the U.K. and the U.S.A. that, in the opposition between uniformity and diversity, with respect to public policy on

language and culture, uniformity is gaining the ascendancy. Instrumental goals are being promoted above integrative goals in language learning and the facts of social diversity which once had the spotlight are being ignored.

Language Education and Public Policy

What are the implications of these changes in public policy for education in societies which continue, whatever the policy, to exhibit linguistic and dialectal diversity? Figure ii represents an attempt to clarify these.

Socio-Political Orientation	Assimilation	Nationalism	Instrumentalism	Multiculturalism
Educational application: languages	Monolingualism	Subtractive bilingualism	Additive bilingualism	Community language maintenance
Educational application: non-standard dialects	Eradicationism	Monodialect-alism	Bidialectalism	Appreciation of dialect differences

Figure ii: Language Education in Relation to Public Policy

Figure ii is not intended to indicate necessary relationships between the various socio-political orientations and educational policies or programmes, but rather to suggest consistencies which would make certain practices in language education seem more plausible than others while certain commitments in social policy prevail.

Assimilation is essentially a policy which turns a blind eye to both the social and the linguistic dimensions of diversity within a society. The educational counterpart of this is to regard monolingualism as normative and to regard interlanguage speakers in terms only of their deficiencies in the language of education. Such students would require remediation.

Similarly, an assimilationist view of non-standard dialect speakers would see their dialect in terms of deficit of the standard dialect, and would require it to be eradicated and replaced so that the student had an adequate linguistic medium of education.

An orientation towards nationalism would involve, for students who are not speakers of the national language, imposed bilingualism in a language which may serve no other purpose than that of purported national unification. Such bilingualism may be subtractive insofar as it implicitly denies the validity of the language the student brings to school, and, indeed, it may subordinate the indigenous values which that language embodies to those of a majority group within or even outside of the culture. Where nationalism is the predominant orientation, dialectal diversity is not likely to be recognized, in that the intention is to promote a view of language as unified and normative. Nationalism, as a language policy objective, is just one step removed from assimilation.

In the U.S.A., as Adam (1991:448) has pointed out, promoters of English in the interests of a 'melting pot' view of society, have repudiated the maintenance of home languages as un-American.

Instrumentalism is associated with the increasing orientation of education to 'labour market requirements' and the 'national good,' perceived in economic terms (see Abbott-Chapman, et al, 1991:8,19). It favours the introduction of a new language into the education system on the basis of its usefulness to the learner or the society.

Such a language may become at some point a medium of education, as in the case of English in many schools in Asia, or French in the Canadian immersion programmes. Instrumentalism always involves additive bilingualism (Lambert's term: see Kalantzis et al 1989:37), in that it adds a language to the student's linguistic repertoire without, at least in the early stages, displacing the student's main language. However, as the Singaporean experience has shown, over a period of time, a language adopted into a community for essentially instrumental purposes may acquire a life of its own, leading to the functional depletion of the mother tongue for some speakers and, perhaps, in time, to language shift. This, it seems to me, is one of the hazards involved in moving too far towards instrumentalism and too far away from multiculturalism as the emphasis of overall policy in a multicultural society.

In the case of students who speak a non-standard dialect of the language of education, the educational policy of bidialectalism or biloquialism is close in spirit to instrumentalism, in that it takes both the non-standard dialect of the learner and the standard language into the educational process with the non-standard dialect being a bridge to the standard, which is the ultimate vehicle of education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Where multiculturalism is the policy, linguistic diversity is seen as essential to both the content and context of learning, rather than being a hindrance to learning or a means to another end. Thus, multicultural policies favour the inclusion of community language maintenance programmes in schooling. While this may appear a realistic objective in terms of its due recognition of the fact of cultural diversity, it comes up against the problem of the intractable extent of that diversity, in that it is not uncommon in some schools to have 20 or more community languages represented. Even the most robust economies of First World countries have not been able to meet the cost to the public purse of a thoroughgoing multiculturalism in public education. This fact, and the economic downturn, no doubt, are directly related to the current retreat from multiculturalism towards instrumentalism. A token alternative has been to include some component of multicultural studies and general language awareness in the school curriculum and to expect communities, with perhaps some government subsidy, to bear the cost of community language maintenance programmes.

When it comes to non-standard dialect speaking children, the educational approach which fits best with a multicultural policy is that which has been called "appreciation of dialect differences" (Tomaras, 1980:33), according to which no attempt is made to change the speech of the non-standard dialect speaker, but teachers, rather, make the adjustment by learning to accept and understand the non-standard dialect speaking child's speech and to use it as a legitimate base for further language development.

Language Teacher Education for Social Cohesion

If such relationships as I have outlined exist between society, social policy and language education, then it is a reasonable expectation of language teacher education that it should help teachers to be aware of them. Teachers with enhanced awareness are those on whom we depend for improving social cohesion through language education. I would advocate aiming in language teacher education for enhanced awareness in five areas: self-awareness, social awareness, student awareness, language awareness and pedagogical awareness.

1. Language teacher education should be self-aware, in terms of the socio-political context in which it operates. Education, including language teacher education, operates in a context where the constants of social and linguistic diversity are reflected in a contingent and imperfect way in public policy. It is important that the language teacher educator maintains an awareness both of the constants which are the inevitable facts of

linguistic and social variation and of the variables which are the changing emphases of public policy, and which will, for different reasons, from time to time elevate one linguistic or social fact over another. Future language teachers will, no doubt, in the course of their career, pass through periodical changes of public policy, but the existence of, and the principles underlying, linguistic diversity in the context in which they are teaching will not change. They need in their teacher education to be enabled to see the educational policy demands of the present against a background of unchanging sociolinguistic principles.

2. A second requirement is social awareness. An adequate teacher education should provide teachers with an awareness of the socio-cultural dimension of their activity and a capacity to evaluate it. The time spent in the teacher education institution should include ample time for thinking. Teacher education should affect people at more than a superficial level. It may, as Tony Wright has said, "necessitate teachers coming to terms with their deeper levels of thought and action" (1990:85). Leo Bartlett and others have called for the development of a "reflective teacher". To become a critically reflective teacher, according to Bartlett,

> means we shall engage in systematic and social forms of inquiry that examine the origin and consequences of everyday teaching so that we come to see the factors that impede change and thus improvement. (Bartlett, 1990:206).

To begin with, a teacher in training should have an awareness of the significance of the selection of languages made by the curriculum. Why do some people not succeed as well as others in an education system? One reason we know is socio-linguistic. To quote Cummins,

> ...considerable research data suggest that, for dominated minorities, the extent to which students' language and culture are incorporated into the school program constitutes a significant predictor of academic success...(quoted in Ada, 1991:449).

A teacher, especially a junior teacher, may not yet have much influence over what languages are recognized in the education being provided. But at least s/he needs to be armed with an awareness of the relationship between the language choice in the curriculum and chances of educational success. Otherwise s/he may blame the students, or himself/herself, for a failure which may be essentially socially determined.

And with respect to the selection of the standard dialect, there is a background of knowledge that the teacher ought to be aware of. What is the standard, and why do we teach it? John Earl Joseph (1987:x) has observed that in doing so we are following a relatively recent European cultural tradition. I have referred to a trend in Australia (though it is not limited to Australia) for a greater attention to prescriptive standards in language. Why is there a public clamour pressuring educational authorities to move in this direction? What are the standard features, anyway, but markers of the superiority of certain members of society! Joseph observes:

> If the standard language were 'native' to a given person, he or she would not need to study it... Prescriptive language education is the means by which standard languages maintain a community of users...By regulating admission to its educational institutions, a culture can very directly control whether knowledge of the standard will be reserved for a select few or spread to those who did not previously have access to it: this is the fundamentally political aspect of language education. (Joseph, 1987:17).

Of course, I am not suggesting that we abandon standards with respect to the languages we are teaching. But I am suggesting that teachers should be aware of what, in terms of the socio-political context, they are doing when they are teaching standard languages. They owe it to their non-standard dialect speaking students to have such knowledge.

Another consideration, with respect to standards, is where the norms should come from, and why. The native speaker norm, long accepted as authoritative in all places where English is taught, and used as the basis for most applied linguistic research used to inform the teaching of English as a foreign language, is being seen now by some as part of a hidden agenda which falsifies the reality of the way English operates in many non-native speaking countries. Phillipson has argued, in this regard:

> The native speaker norm, which is the standard against which the second/foreign language learner is compared, is not a 'neutral' phenomenon, but one which is historically created, and in our class-biased society it serves as a filter for social and educational success...In other words, the theories that SLA research draws on conceal social reality...(Phillipson, 1991:39).

As teachers are made aware of the social implications of the kind of tasks in which they are routinely involved, they will have a basis for understanding how language can be illegitimately used to circumscribe the life chances of some societies and some members of society.

Indeed, there are some important myths that need to be dispelled as part of the process of teacher education [illegible] one is the myth that linguistic conformity to the norms of a dominant group in a society will be rewarded by acceptance into that group. As Ada has observed,

> In spite of the fact that the American society claims to respect the ideals of equality, diversity and inclusion, the reality for language minority people has been inequality, the push for conformity to one standard, and exclusion. One of the greatest contradictions confronting minorities is that society urges them to become mainstream and thereby abandon their language and cultural traditions, but even after they assume the views and behaviour of the majority culture in hope of increased acceptance, they often continue to be victimized by the same forces that compelled their conformity (Ada, 1991:453).

A teacher education for social cohesion must expose the misleading appearance of cohesion which underlies a linguistic uniformity which is the result of inequality.

It is necessary also that teachers be made aware, as part of their education, of language education problems which are really the reflection of social problems, or of the mismatch between social realities and educational goals. An obvious example is literacy. The endemic "literacy crises," which serve as such convenient standbys to politicians seeking election, can often, as Resnick and Resnick (1991:136) have said,

> be attributed to the relatively rapid extension to large populations of educational criteria that were once applied to only a limited elite.

Associated with this may be the recognition, on the part of the would-be literate, that literacy is being offered to them along with assorted cultural baggage which they are not prepared to accept because of its denial of the way of life they know (McLaren, 1991:294).

Another area in which teacher awareness can be enhanced is that of classroom discourse. Teachers, as they manage classroom discourse are regulating not only the subject matter and the participation of the students, but also the extent to which the students are able to maintain, or are forced to lose, face (Malcolm, 1991). Often, this may be unconscious, but an analysis of transcripts from practice teaching can bring it to the awareness of the trainee teacher. It has been argued (Bordieu, in Giroux, 1983:32) that some of the most trival things teachers say may be the most revealing, in that, in focusing on little details of dress, bearing and manners, they may be imposing on students class-based systems of behaviour. A teacher education for social cohesion may well begin as one designed to achieve such cohesion in linguistically and socially diverse classrooms.

3. It has been claimed by Christopher Brumfit (1987:16) that teacher education has, since the mid-sixties, focused decreasingly on personal development and become more and more technocratized. There is, however, substantial evidence that, especially in the field of language education, teacher attitudes, particularly in relation to their expectations of their students, constitute one of the more important variables affecting student success. A teacher should be an interesting person, a person who is stimulating to talk to and who will cause students to want to talk. As Brumfit has said,

> It matters very little what learners can do in the language if they have no motivation, knowledge of the world and local and foreign cultures, or self-confidence to make use of what they can technically perform for the expression of their own needs, feelings and ideas. (1987:19).

In 1990 I was involved in a study of the teaching of languages in all the institutions of higher education in Australia. One of the things we were seeking to find out was what motivated students to learn languages and teachers to teach them. The results clearly showed that the students' main motivation in learning languages at university was to use them, especially in spoken form, in interaction with native speakers, and in their employment.

The students and graduates we surveyed agreed in ranking oral/aural skills top of the list of their desired course outcomes, and in expressing the desire to have their courses oriented more to oral communication. When asked

why they chose to teach languages, a strong majority of the teachers gave as their reason "love of languages." (See further, Leal, 1991).

What attracts people about languages, whether as students or as teachers, is the possibility of using them in authentic communication. Teacher education should foster and build on this natural attraction which languages possess. For this, teachers need to be relaxed, accepting persons who are approachable and interesting to talk to. Their teacher education should provide both the opportunity for developing fluency in the language and the personal development to make them people worth talking to.

It is also necessary for teachers to be given in their training an awareness of the linguistic and experiential resources which students bring to education, so that they may draw on this in their teaching. Alma Flor Ada has proposed what she calls "creative education" in language teaching, by which she means,

> ...students learn to understand and appreciate themselves, to use that understanding as a means of valuing the diversity of others, to reflect critically upon their experiences so that these can be a source of growth, and to respond creatively to the world around them (Ada, 1991:449).

It can be expected, then, that one of the consequences of producing reflective teachers, if we do it properly, will be that we will produce reflective students, and that both will use one another as a resource for learning.

4. Fourthly, we need to give our prospective language teachers language awareness. Their teacher education should equip them to deal with language variation in an informed way.

As we have observed, linguistic diversity is all-pervasive and, even if it is not represented in the education system, it will be represented in the students.

Often teachers will encounter language variation when students say things to them which they don't immediately understand. When this happens, a properly sensitized teacher will explore the misunderstanding and seek to arrive at an explanation for it on linguistic or pragmatic principles.

Observations in many classrooms (reported on in Malcolm, 1991) have shown me that people need to be trained to do this. When they lack that training, they are liable to correct the child for what is not in error, ignore what the child has said, or make a response which, from the child's point of view, is deviant.

They also need awareness of the facts about language diversity in relation to education. As we have observed, the pendulum of public policy is liable to swing between the poles of acceptance and rejection of linguistic diversity, and when public policy favours uniformity, arguments about the dangers of multilingualism in education will sound plausible. Teachers need to be equipped with knowledge that bilingualism need not be subtractive and that the educational recognition of the mother tongue in an appropriate programme does not threaten the acquisition of a second language as a medium of education (c.f. Ada, 1991:448). Such knowledge needs to be accompanied by a level of awareness of social diversity which goes beyond the "simple pluralist model" (Kalantzis, et al, 1989) which has lain behind a now largely discredited concept of multicultural education.

Not least, teachers need awareness of how <u>they</u> use language in classrooms, and to be alerted to where they may attempt to settle matters on the basis of their superior power rather than on the basis of what has actually been said or intended by the child.

5. Finally, teacher education needs to incorporate <u>pedagogical</u> awareness. I am not here referring to the content of methodology courses, but rather to awareness, on the part of the teacher educator, of how to teach in a higher education setting.

There is a temptation in universities to value research above teaching, despite the fact that, to produce good researchers, universities must first engage in good teaching. Ernest Boyer, who is president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, has argued for the reinstatement of teaching at university level as a scholarly enterprise.

According to this view, teacher educators in universities and colleges should exhibit "the scholarship of teaching" (1992:26,28). In particular, he notes that:

> ...knowing and learning are communal acts. With this vision, great teachers create a common ground of intellectual

> commitment. They stimulate active, not passive, learning and encourage students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning after their college days are over (Boyer, 1992:28).

Where teaching is thus conceived, the institution of learning is a place of challenge and extension, but also of collaboration and mutual endeavour. It illustrates the level of honest enquiry and of mutual acceptance of teacher and learner which, one would hope, the trainee teacher would carry into the context where he is the mentor.

Universities should be places for mutual growth of teacher and taught in the face of challenging issues which do not yield unilateral answers.

Many teachers in bilingual classes, according to a recent study in the U.S.A., have the sense of being low in prestige, isolated, inadequate and powerless. The author of this study reports:

> Unfortunately, many teacher education programs seem designed to train teachers to accept social realities rather than to question them. Teachers are trained to conform to a mechanistic definition of their role rather than to recognize it as involving a relationship between human beings, with a possibility of growth for both teachers and students (Ada, 1991:449-450).

We need to look forward to a language teacher education which will be both based on awareness and leading towards awareness as teachers and teachers-to-be are engaged together in "a relationship of authentic dialogue" (Freire, 1991:253).

Conclusion

This paper has attempted to argue the case for incorporating a "rich socio-cultural dimesion" (Das, 1987:22) into language teacher education. If this is to happen, how can it start?

I am told that the famous conductor Herbert von Karajan was once asked why he preferred the Berlin Philharmonic to the Vienna Philharmonic. He replied: "When I tell the Berliners to step forward, they do it; when I tell the Viennese to

step forward they do it, then they ask why." I am among you today as one who asks why, and who urges you and the teachers you train to do the same.

If linguistic diversity is a reflection of social diversity and, as such, of the complex of identities which makes a society unique, then language teaching, with the necessary selections it takes from, or additions it makes to, the linguistic repertoire of members of the society, and the implicit evaluations it makes of speaker selections, is deeply engaged in the maintenance or otherwise of social cohesion.

Teacher education can prepare teachers for this situation by making language education socially relevant. It will best do this, I believe, by working towards enhancing the awareness of teachers with respect to social and linguistic diversity, largely through raising questions about what, in the past, has often been taken for granted.

REFERENCES

ABBOTT-CHAPMAN, J., Hughes, P., & Wyndham, C., 1991. Improving Access to Disadvantaged Youth in Higher Education. Department of Employment, Education and Training, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

ADA, A.F., 1991. "Creative Education for Bilingual Teachers." In Masahiko Minami and Bruce P. Kennedy (eds) Language Issues in Literacy and Bilingual/Multilingual Education. Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series No. 22, Cambridge, MA.

Advisory Council on Multicultural Affairs. 1988. Towards a National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia. A Discussion Paper. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Australian Ethnic Affairs Council Committee on Multicultural Education. 1979. Perspectives on Multicultural Education Department of Immigration & Ethnic Affairs, Canberra.

Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs. 1982. Multiculturalism for all Australians: Our Developing Nationhood. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Australian Department of Employment, Education and Training. 1991. Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BARLETT, L., 1990. "Teacher Development through Reflective Teaching." In Jack C. Richards and David Nunan (eds) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

BOYER, E., 1992. "What it Means to be a Scholar: The Role of the University Academic." ACU Bulletin of Current Documentation, 102, February, pp.26-28.

BREEN, M.P., 1991. "Understanding the Language Teacher." In R. Phillipson et al (eds): Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

BRUMFIT, C., 1987. "A 'Whole Profession' Model of Continuing Teacher Education." In Verner Bickley (ed.): Re-exploring CELT: Continuing Education for Language Teachers. Institute of Language in Education, Education Department, Hong Kong.

CHEN, S., 1989. "Language and Culture: Two Goals of FL Teaching in China." Australian Review of Applied Linguistics 12, 1:36-60.

CHOMSKY, C., 1991. "Stages in Language Development and Reading Exposure." In Masahito Minam and Bruce P. Kennedy (eds) Language Issues in Literacy and Bilingual/Multilingual Education. Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series No. 22, Cambridge, MA.

DAS, B.K., 1987. "Caring and Sharing in Language Teacher Education" in Verner Bickley (ed.) Re-exploring CELT: Continuing Education for Language Teachers Institute of Language in Education, Education Department, Hong Kong.

FREIRE, P., 1991. "The Adult Literacy Process as Cultural Action for Freedom." In Masahito Minami and Bruce P. Kennedy (eds) Language Issues in Literacy and Bilingual/Multilingual Education. Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series No. 22, Cambridge, MA.

GEBHARD, J.G., Gaitan, S., & Oprandy, R., 1990. "Beyond Prescription: The Student Teacher as Investigator." In Jack C. Richards and David Nunan (eds) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

GIROUX, H., 1983. Critical Theory and Educational Practice. Deakin University Press, Victoria.

JOSEPH, J.E., 1987. Eloquence and Power: The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages. Frances Pinter, London.

KALANTZIS, M., Cope, B., & Slade, D., 1989. Minority Languages and Dominant Culture Falmer Press, London.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

KALE, J., 1989. "Language Planning and the Language of Education". In Richard Baldauf Jr and Allan Luke (eds) Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

LEAL, R.B., et al 1991. Widening Our Horizons. Report of the Review of the Teaching of Modern Languages in Higher Education. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

MALCOLM, IAN G., 1991. "All Right Then, if You Don't Want to Do That...: Strategy and Counter-strategy in Classroom Discourse Management." In Guidelines, December.

MALCOLM, IAN G., forthcoming. "English in the Education of Speakers of Aboriginal English." To appear in Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 1992.

McLAREN, P.L., 1991. "Culture or Canon? Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Literacy." In Masahito Minami and Bruce P. Kennedy (eds) Language Issues in Literacy and Bilingual/Multilingual Education. Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series No. 22, Cambridge, MA.

PAULSTON, C.B., 1987. "Communicative Language Teaching and Intercultural Communication." In Verner Bickley (ed.) Re-exploring CELT: Continuing Education for Language Teachers. Institute of Language in Education, Education Department, Hong Kong.

PHILLIPSON, R., 1991. "Some Items on the Hidden Agenda of Second/Foreign Language Acquisition." In Phillipson, Robert et al (eds) Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

RESNICK, D. P., & Resnick, L.B., 1991. "The Nature of Literacy: An Historical Exploration." In Masahito Minami and Bruce P. Kennedy (eds) Language Issues in Literacy and Bilingual Education. Harvard Educational Review Reprint Series No. 22, Cambridge, MA.

SEET, A.M., 1991. "Language Competence: A Necessary Means of Survival in a Modern Society." RELC Newsletter, August, p.2.

Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts., 1984. Report on a National Language Policy. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

SHIMBORI, M., 1960. "A Historical and Social Note on Moral Education in Japan." In Comparative Education Review 4,2:97-101.

SHUY, R.W. (ed.) c1964. Social Dialects and Language Learning. N.C.T.E., Champaign, Illinois.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STUBBS, M., 1990. "The State of English in the English State: Reflections on the Cox Report." Language and Education 3, 4:235-250.

THOMAS, A., 1989. "Language Planning in Vanuatu." In Richard Baldauf Jr and Allan Luke (eds) Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

TOMARAS, S.N., 1980. Nonstandard Dialects in the Classroom: A Study of Elementary and Secondary Teachers' Perceptions, Expectations and Coping Strategies in a Selected School District. PhD Thesis, University of Washington.

TSUDA, Y., 1986. Language Inequality and Distortion in Intercultural Communication: A Critical Theory Approach. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

WRIGHT, T., 1990. "Understanding Classroom Role Relationships." In Jack C. Richards and David Nunan (eds) Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.